

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 892

SP 003 253

TITLE Experimental Pilct Program in Teacher Education. Report for the Period February-June 1969.

INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. City Coll., School of Education.

Pub Date Jun 69

Note 21p.; N.Y.S. Department Education Grant No. C34390

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.15

Descriptors Field Experience Programs, *Pilot Projects, *Preservice Education, Program Development, Teacher Education Curriculum

Identifiers EPPTE, Experimental Pilct Program in Teacher Education

Abstract

This paper reports the last phase of planning and development for the Experimental Pilct Program in Teacher Education (EPPTE) which begins in September 1969 as an effort to find an effective alternative to the conventional model for training teachers. Activities of the project staff are described in the areas of (1) Publicity, including response from the profession and prospective staff and students; (2) Recruitment, which called for half the applicants from the usual admission channels and half through Project SEEK; (3) Admissions, conducted solely on the basis of interviews; (4) Administration and Policy Development, the work of the Planning and Development Committee and its subcommittees on Curriculum and Field Work, Admissions, and Staff; (5) Curriculum and Development (Content and Form), particularly course descriptions for the 4-year, 36-credit-hour professional sequence consisting of six hours of field work with two hours seminar per week for 30 weeks; and (6) the Liberal Arts and Science Requirements, which involved cooperative efforts of the School of Education and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In each area the report sets forth priority tasks, mostly administrative, required before the program can function effectively. A sample student schedule for the 8-semester program is included. (JS)

ED033892

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE CITY COLLEGE, THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10031

EXPERIMENTAL PILOT PROGRAM IN TEACHER EDUCATION

REPORT FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY-JUNE 1969

N.Y.S. DEPT. EDUCATION GRANT NO. C34390

James J. Shields, Jr.
Director

JUNE
1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

SP003253

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Publicity	1
Recruitment	3
Admissions	5
Administration and Policy Development	5
Curriculum Development: Content and Form	7
The Liberal Arts and Science Requirements	13
Conclusion	15

PREFACE

The first five months have been devoted to planning and development; the real test of the value of the Pilot Program will not begin until September 1969 when the first Program participants arrive on campus. Thus, this report was not written as an evaluation as such, but as an historical account of the activities of the Program staff over the last few months. In addition, it sets forth the priority tasks, mostly of an administrative nature, that remain to be done before the Program can obtain the sure footing required for effective functioning.

INTRODUCTION

In mid-February, the Office of the Urban Teacher Corps of the State of New York granted City College funds to support the last phase of planning and development for the Experimental Pilot Program in Teacher Education (EPTE). The grant was small, \$5,000, so small in fact, that the School of Education had to secure about \$3,600 from its general funds to maintain the planning activities even on a minimal level. Nonetheless, the significance and impact of the grant was great.

The grant was significant in that it was one of the few grants given by the State to stimulate a radically different approach to the preparation of teachers for ghetto youth. The purposes of the Pilot Program go beyond the production of more teachers who meet State certification requirements. Primarily, the Program has been designed to find an effective alternative to the conventional model for training teachers. To this end, formal education courses will be replaced with closely supervised field experiences accompanied by weekly seminars.¹

The grant came to be interpreted by the Faculty of the School of Education as a vote of confidence by the State Department of Education of the more than three years of work by Faculty committees to develop a new approach to teacher education. The grant was an important factor in stimulating active Faculty involvement in the planning and development activities even among those who previously had expressed strong reservations about the new program. In fact, this support and involvement was so widespread that when the Pilot Program came before the Faculty for approval, it was accepted with little or no discussion from the floor within minutes after it was presented.

PUBLICITY

Immediately upon receipt of the grant, the College Public Relations Office issued a news release describing the innovative aspects of the program and identifying the Office of the Urban Teacher Corps as a major source of funding for the program. As a result, news items appeared in the New York Daily News, the New York Post, and the New York Times. Subsequently, articles on the program also appeared in the City College Report, the City College Alumnus, the Teacher Education News and Notes (Division of Teacher Education, the City University of New York).

1. A full description of the program objectives can be found in James J. Shields, Jr., "Experimental Pilot Program in Teacher Education A Proposal," N. Y., City College, The City University of New York, The School of Education, December 1968, 15 pp., Unpublished.

Sf003090

The response to the publicity was overwhelming. Professionals in the field of education responded with notes of encouragement and praise for the program which they felt appeared to be an extremely promising attempt to effect long overdue reform in teacher education. One respondent involved in the Elementary Science Study in Newton, Massachusetts wrote from an airplane crossing the Atlantic to indicate how impressed he was with the Program. A Professor of Education at another campus of the University wrote, "I believe that the Experimental Program has the greatest merit in that your faculty is confronting many issues and attempting to deal with many shortcomings in educational programs." An executive officer of one of the Colleges in the State University complex with a strong commitment to teacher education was so excited by the program's possibilities that he arranged to spend a day at the College to discuss the program with the planning committee and the administrative staff. By far the most enthusiastic reaction to the program came from members of a committee within the Public Education Association (PEA) who currently are engaged in an in-depth study of teacher preparation in New York City.

The publicity also elicited considerable response from individuals, both within the College and outside, who are interested in joining the staff. Predictably, they were extremely generous in their praise for the Program. One individual interested in a position wrote, "I just want you to know how very impressed I am by the soundness of this new approach. Everything I have learned about teacher education in urban schools cries out in favor of just such an empirical and pragmatic redesign..."

The quality of those applying for staff positions from outside the College was surprisingly high. Unfortunately, the applicants had to be informed that because of the uncertainty of additional funding from the State and because of the high degree of interest in the program among those already on staff at the College, staffing for this year at least would be met from within the College. As a result, there are few staff members who are black and Puerto Rican or who have had recent teaching experience in urban ghetto elementary or secondary schools. This situation will have to be corrected. Unfortunately, the solution is not entirely in the hands of the Director of the Pilot Program; it rests largely within the Appointments Committee of the several Departments within the School of Education.

The greatest response came from those interested in matriculating in the program. Unfortunately, few met the regular academic standards established for admission to the College. And many, who appeared to qualify for Project SEEK, found they did not qualify because they were slightly over-age.² Due to the paucity of funds, a large percentage of those who qualified for Project SEEK were not accepted and thus did not achieve access to the Program.

-
2. Project SEEK offers an alternate channel to those who do meet the usual admission standards of the College and who have low family incomes and live in poverty-designated neighborhoods.

Also, it turned out that the few who seemed as though they might have met the regular academic standards established for admission to the College could not be considered because the deadline for submitting applications to the College had passed. Actually, the deadline was one month before the State grant was received. Thus, the pool from which students could be selected was limited to people who had submitted their applications to the College and to those already in Project SEEK. This was an unforeseen and unfortunate problem.

As this problem became fully apparent, it was feared that the Program would not be able to meet its quota of one hundred qualified students. This, however, did not prove to be a difficulty. The most serious problem created by the admission's strictures was that a large number of highly qualified individuals who could have lifted the quality, tone and richness of the Program had to be discouraged. These included individuals such as the thirty-five year old mother of a school age child whose experience included work as administrator of a bookmobile which brought reference books, art prints, and paperback books into disadvantaged communities; a mother who supported her family working in community centers and in addition contributed time to a local Head Start program; a licensed practical nurse; and a number of people employed as educational assistants in ghetto schools.

Clearly, the Program Director must take immediate steps to secure discretionary power from the Board of Higher Education for the School of Education to establish its own admission standards. In this way, Program participants can be admitted with an impressive record of post-high school achievements, but with poor high school records. These are individuals who clearly have the potential for becoming highly effective teachers in ghetto schools, but who are denied the opportunity to do so because of age (over thirty, but under forty), financial status, and poor high school records.

RECRUITMENT

The program design called for two types of Program participants. Approximately fifty per cent were to be selected from applicants who were admitted to City College through the usual admission channels. The remaining fifty per cent were to be selected from a pool of students recommended by the Directors of Project SEEK at City College and at the University Center and the Director of the College Discovery Program.

Although the Director of the College Discovery Program was extremely cooperative in furnishing names of qualified candidates, admission strictures precluded acting on his recommendations. The Director of the University Center SEEK program declined to cooperate until the university budget was clarified. However, agreement on the budget was not reached until April and at that point he was so occupied with repairing the damage done to his Program by the budget delay that he was not able to work out a

cooperative agreement with the Pilot Program. This left the City College Project SEEK program as the sole source of applicants for the second category of candidates. Fortunately, the Director and the staff of the City College SEEK Program were most cooperative and interest among SEEK in the Pilot Program ran very high. As a result, the SEEK counselors found it quite easy to nominate fifty highly qualified students for the Pilot Program.

The next task was to reach the approximately fifty students who were to be selected from those who were accepted for admission through the usual admission channels. This was accomplished in two ways. First, all students accepted for admission to the College received a special brochure describing the program and inviting them to become participants. They were told in the brochure that if they were interested in learning more about the program or in obtaining an application they were to complete the tear-out sheet and return it along with their other registration materials. Of the 115 students who completed the tear-out sheet and returned it, approximately 85 students expressed further interest in the Program.

Another effort to reach these students was made by contacting all the guidance counselors in the New York City Public high schools by letter. In this letter, which was accompanied by a packet of brochures describing the program, the counselors were asked to publicize the program among potential City College acceptees. In addition to mentioning the program, they were also asked to distribute copies of the brochure.

In the normal course of events, applicants are sent acceptances to the College in March and are sent packets containing registration materials early in April. However, this year late in February the President and the Board of Higher Education notified the staff that the budget situation would possibly delay admissions of the freshman class until July 1.

If this, indeed, happened, the Pilot Program would have been faced with a number of serious problems. It would have meant that information regarding half the potentially available students would not have been available prior to the summer vacation. That would have meant that someone on the staff would have had to be retained during the summer to correspond with interested students and to interview them. This, of course, would have entailed additional funding.

One of the ways that was suggested to circumvent these problems was to admit freshmen already at the College. This would have meant that these students in each semester of their sophomore year would have had to take a double load of field experiences and seminars. In other words, they would combine the freshman and sophomore experiences into one year. The idea was favorably received by the Deans and the Department Chairmen. However, the budget crisis was resolved toward the end of April and no decision had to be reached on whether or not to admit sophomores.

In terms of this year's experiences with recruitment, it is apparent that a major effort has to be made very early in the fall to reach students in all the senior high schools around the city. This can be done through assembly programs, career conferences, and in special meetings arranged through guidance counselors. In addition, information on the Program can be included in the packet of materials sent to potential applicants by the City University Admissions Processing Center.

ADMISSIONS

The admissions process was fairly simple. The Director of the Program held a series of meetings with the counselors on the Project SEEK staff at the College to inform them about the goals of the program and to give them an idea of the types of students who could benefit most from the Program. On the basis of this information the counselors nominated fifty students who had expressed interest and whom they felt were best qualified for the Program. Each of the students was known to one counselor intimately. These students had been at the College for at least a year and had talked with a counselor at a minimum, once a week. No amount of testing, interviewing, or record analysis could have provided the Pilot Program staff with the insights into these students that the counselors had. Nonetheless, the Pilot Program Director reserved the right to reject nominees. However, in fact no reason was found to exercise this right.

The remaining group of students, those who were admitted to the College through the usual channels and who expressed an interest in the Program, were invited to a meeting at the College. Of those who had initially expressed interest, 85 attended. Following the meeting, those who continued to be interested were interviewed by a member of the staff. In all, 68 students were interviewed. Of these, 31 were accepted into the Program and acceptances for 19 students are still pending.

Each interviewer was provided with an interview guide which covered items such as: (1) interest in the Program; (2) potential for impact; (3) social consciousness; (4) degree of self-confidence, and, (5) flexibility. The interviews were used as the sole basis for admission. Clearly, in the future more sophisticated techniques for selection will have to be devised. Contact with each applicant's guidance counselor and letters of recommendation from teachers immediately come to mind as potentially valuable techniques for use in the selection process.

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The major function of the Program Director was to coordinate the efforts of the Planning and Development Committee. In addition, the Director had full responsibility for the publicity and recruitment activities already discussed and for working with the Dean in selecting the new Program Director, Committee members, and the faculty to supervise the laboratory experiences and to conduct the seminars.

The Deans of the School of Education had primary responsibility for securing approval for the Program from the Board of Higher Education, the City University Committee on Teacher Coordination, the Curriculum Committees at the College, and the Faculty of the School of Education. This job was tedious and extremely time-consuming. However, the approval of each of these groups is absolutely necessary before any new program in teacher education can function officially at the City University of New York.

The Planning and Development Committee initially was composed of seven members drawn from the four departments within the School of Education: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Social and Psychological Foundations, and School Services. All the members of this committee were given some released time from their regular schedules to work with the Program. In fact, the entire State grant was used to cover some of the costs involved in providing the released time for the Committee members and the Director. As a result, this meant that there were no funds for secretarial services or office expenses, a limitation that severely limited the effective use of staff time.

Shortly after the committee began to function, efforts were made to expand the committee membership to include key community leaders, local school administrators, liberal arts and science faculty members, additional members of the faculty from the School of Education and representatives from Project SEEK. Dean Gabriella de Beer of the College of Liberal Arts and Science and Professor Robert Young of Project SEEK were asked to serve on the committee. However, a student revolution and the ensuing atmosphere of tension afterward rendered it impossible for them to assume an active role on the committee.

Community leaders and local school administrators were contacted and agreed to serve. However, they were contacted late and again because of the upset surrounding the student revolution were not informed on any consistent basis of the committee's meetings. As a result, there were practically no community leaders or local school administrators involved in the Committee's work.

The most successful effort to expand the committee was in the area of student involvement. Three students participated on a regular and an equal basis and in an active way. Their contributions were sincere and valuable. Overall, their work on the committee augurs well for the current trend toward increased student involvement in the formulation of university policy. New Pilot Program staff members were added to the committee as their appointments became known. Mr. Melvin Bye, the newly appointed Director of the Program, played a particularly important and valuable role in the Committee's work.

In terms of the membership of the Committee, a priority task is an early and intensive drive to add community leaders and local school administration who can play a regular and an active role on the Committee. This should be easier to achieve once the Program is underway, and when students are working in local schools and in the communities. Also, at that time, the

fact that students are working in field situations will make it even more pressing that local school and community representatives serve on the Committee.

Early in the deliberations of the Committee, plans were made for an all-day meeting of the Committee to assess its progress in developing the specifics of the first year and at least a tentative structure for the next three years of the Program. At the meeting, which was held at the College on April 7, most of the discussion centered on the content of the seminars and on the nature of the field experiences. However, a few decisions were reached regarding the administration of the Program.

It was agreed to establish three subcommittees which were to meet weekly. These were a Curriculum and Field Work Committee, an Admissions Committee, and a Staff Committee. Another decision was that all staff members would be requested to meet on a regular basis as a group with a leader whose sole function in the Program would be to coordinate staff meetings. A major function of these meetings will be to evaluate over time the viability of the Program's goals and the value of the experiences provided through the Program in achieving them. As necessary, staff training activities are to be built into the meetings as well. Primarily, however, the meetings are to function so that each staff member has an on-going opportunity to examine his or her effectiveness in the Program.

There are still a number of problems of an administrative character that remain to be settled. First, Program approval for purposes of certification has to be acquired from the State Education Department and from the Board of Examiners of the City of New York. Secondly, machinery has to be created for the formal evaluation of the program by a professional evaluation team. These, along with the need to expand the Planning and Development Committee to include representatives from the College of Liberal Arts and Science, Project SEEK, key community members, and local school administrators, are among the most serious administrative tasks yet to be handled.

Less immediate, but nonetheless important, are questions concerning the desirability of residence facilities for students in the Program and the creation of an independent laboratory school. These latter questions will assume more importance as the Program moves into its second and third year. Funding lingers behind each of these problems and questions as a major factor in working out satisfactory answers. In terms of funding, the Chancellor's Fund and the central office of Project SEEK appear to be the most promising avenues for additional financial support.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: CONTENT AND FORM

The old ways are the known ways and thus for many the easy and comfortable ways. For this reason, change is difficult to achieve and educational reform more often than not amounts to little more than a watered down restructuring of existing programs. A major task facing the Planning and Development Committee is to create a Program that is professionally sound and one that really constitutes a step away from traditional programs.

This was achieved by persistently standing by the Program's original objective of integrating courses in social and philosophical foundations, psychological foundations, and curriculum and teaching methods into one academic experience. The basic method for doing this was through providing for early, generous, and continuous opportunities for field and laboratory experiences accompanied by weekly seminars. Field and laboratory experiences were firmly planted at the very center of the Program.

As the full plan crystalized and arrangements were made for actually initiating the Program the implications of the actual curricular changes became clearer. This resulted in a good amount of uncertainty and equivocation among many of the faculty who had given their support to the Program. This, of course, was predicable because few academics, in fact, believe that classroom and field activities can become an integrated or intellectual experience. Also, academics have a vested interest in perpetuating the model of college teaching as a series of neat packages prepared in advance. Any number of staff members asked questions along the order of "...when are you covering S-R theory or when are time-lines going to be taught?" In effect, what was being asked was "...on what day, month, and year is such and such material scheduled to be covered?"

Three of the more perplexing problems bearing upon the field work and seminar experiences were: (1) the number of hours of field work to be required weekly; (2) the amount of field supervision to be provided; and (3) the number of students to be assigned to each seminar. Finally, each of these problems had to be resolved on the basis of available funding and within the context of curricular requirements established within the College of Liberal Arts and Science and beyond the control of the Program staff.

The Katz-Elam Report, upon which much of the thinking about the field-work-program is based, recommends that provision be made for eight hours weekly of field work.³ In terms of the philosophy of the Program and sound pedagogy, this does not appear to be an excessive requirement. However, in actuality, eight hours works out to be an impossible requirement.

In the Pilot Program students receive only two college credits for their field work. The tradition at the College has been that a student puts in two hours in the field for each college credit he receives. On this basis, students can only be expected to put in four hours per week in the field. One answer would be to increase the number of credit hours given for field work. However, the pressures imposed by other courses and program requirements and traditions render such an increase impossible. As a result, the planning committee had to settle on a field work requirement of from four to six hours.

3. Florine Katz, The Samuel B. Heckman Educational Clinic, The City College, The City University of New York, in a letter to James J. Shields, Jr. dated January 6, 1969.

The Katz-Elam Report also recommended that seminars be limited to fifteen students. However, the Dean reluctantly suggested that this number be changed to twenty. He pointed out that the Pilot Program is considerably more expensive than conventional programs and that the expenses had to be held within bounds if there are to be any chances at all for replicating the Program on a wider scale. However, he also suggested that six hours of faculty time instead of four be assigned to each seminar-field-work group. In this way, provision was made for increasing faculty-time by a third to meet the increase in the size of the seminar group by a third. The Dean's recommendation was approved by the Planning Committee.

The Planning Committee reluctantly approved the field supervisor-student ratio that had to be accepted because of the limited financial resources available for the Program. Many felt that finally it could lead to the undoing of the Program's effectiveness. However, they also felt that various devices are available which possibly could serve to minimize this limitation. For instance, field supervisors could be assigned to work with students over a two-year period. Also, training programs could be set up for the staff of the elementary school where the Pilot Program participants work in order to train the staff how best to incorporate the Program participants into their schools.

The Planning Committee gave considerable attention to the format of the seminars. In order to achieve flexibility in arranging sessions for the full group and for moving program participants and staff from group to group, it was decided to schedule the meetings of all seminar groups for the same day and hour.

Also, it was decided that students in the program should be encouraged to go beyond observation reports, term papers, and book reports in meeting course requirements. Some alternatives suggested were tape recordings, films, photographs and dramatic productions. In fact the Committee felt that this may become one of the richest areas for experimentation and research in the Program.

One commentator on the program who has had extensive experience with the British teacher education model wrote:

"Some English training colleges provide a whole series of craft and art experiences...as real life adult experiences which are intrinsically rewarding and sharable with children. The study of music in an English college might include a lab course in making musical instruments. Physical education is usually an attempt to creatively involve the whole body in improvised dance-drama, movement, and gymnastic activities. Many future teachers pick up photography, film making, sculpturing, and drama directing as output from their course work. There is a certain consistency with these experiences and the 'types' children seem most attracted to. By letting current experiences help us define our (teacher education) program, and by including intrinsically rewarding life activities in these programs we, I think, will be helping future teachers force and face times of rapid change." ⁴

4. Jay Hauben, Education Development Center, Newton, Massachusetts in a letter to James J. Shields, Jr., dated March 17, 1969.

Because of the flexibility in the seminar structure and because course assignments will be made as the students' questions require them and not as the basis of course outlines and prescribed reading lists, it is essential that those appointed to the staff be people who are able to listen and to learn from their students. Also, they must be individuals who are skilled in group processes. Over the long run, ability in this area will play as great if not a greater role than intellectual and technical competency. For this reason, staff were sought who perceive teacher education programs primarily as action-oriented rather than subject-matter based, who believe that teacher training has to be kept as close as possible to the situation for which teacher trainees are being prepared, and who are truly committed to program flexibility.⁵

A major task of the program director in consultation with the Deans was to encapsule the thinking of the planning committee into a series of brief course descriptions for the College catalogue. The course descriptions finally agreed upon read as follows:

Ed. 331-312 (Elementary Education) and Ed. 321-322 (Secondary Education) Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, I.

The study of children in school settings. Systematic observation and analyses of the school situation--curriculum, teaching, faculty, services. Selection of six children per student for intensive study and assistance. Seminars will analyze and evaluate field-work experience within the context of current writing and research in the humanities and the social sciences.

Six hours field work and two hours seminar per week.
30 weeks. 4 cr. per semester.

Ed. 313-314 (Elementary Education) and Ed. 323-324 (Secondary Education) Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, II.

Study of the urban community and out-of-school educational forces. Visits may include government agencies, religious institutions, community action groups. Meetings with families of the case-study-group children. A community study or survey will be required.

Six hours field work and two hours seminar per week.
30 weeks. 4 cr. per semester.

5. Based upon thinking reflected in Gordon L. Lippitt, "Consulting with a National Organization: A Case Study." The Journal of Social Issues, XV (1959), 25.

Ed. 315-316 (Elementary Education) and Ed. 325-326
(Secondary Education) Education Field Work Laboratory
and Seminar, II.

Intensive study of the teaching-learning process
including development of curricula, use of diagnostic -
instruments and materials, use of newer media in class-
room instruction. Video-taped micro-teaching. Service
as a teaching assistant. Development and completion of
a creative project with the case-study-group children.
Second semester may be spent in a different school
setting (suburban, private, or experimental public school).

Six hours field work and two hours seminar per week.
30 weeks. 4 cr. per semester.

.
Ed. 317-318 (Elementary Education) and Ed. 327-328
(Secondary Education) Student Teaching and Seminar.

Supervised student teaching, five mornings and one
afternoon per week. Also supervised field trips to other
schools, school systems and special projects.

Minimum of 17 hours per week for field work. 2 hours
seminar per week, for 30 weeks. 6 cr. per semester.

The Katz-Elam Report provides a broader statement of how program
participants may utilize their time in the field and in seminars. What
follows is a description of possible Program activities for the first year
excerpted, with a few changes as noted, from the Katz-Elam Report.

Freshman Year

First Half (Seven Weeks)

For seven weeks students will observe in a school (for two
to three hours, two days each week).⁶ They will go systematically
from class to class on a given grade, spending twenty minutes in
each classroom. They will begin over again, so to speak, having
in the meantime met in seminars two hours (once a week).⁷

For these first observations, the students will set their
observational structure. The focus of the seminars will grow out
of what they report and the questions they raise. It is expected

6. In the Katz-Elam Report this section read, "...two hours four
mornings each week."

7. In the Katz-Elam Report the rest of the sentence reads, "...four
times a week following their observational seminars."

that observational skills will have become sharpened during the first three weeks, so that the students will have become quite expert and organized as observers by the end of their seventh week.

During the first hour of each seminar there should be three groups of five students each talking together about their observational experiences and their questions. The three team members would circulate among the groups to listen, and where appropriate make inferences, sharpen points, raise questions. During the second hour, the group of fifteen would come together and share an intergroup experience.

As questions are raised appropriate assignments will be made. Some may be reading assignments. Sometimes films or video-tape recordings will best answer questions. Assignments will probably differ for individual students, since their needs and their levels of experience will be different.

Second Half (Eight Weeks)

Each student will now have his six children, chosen by him from a given class (where possible). He will study and learn how to interpret the school record card data and focus on the similarities and differences in the record and the child's observed behavior. He will now stop observing in the classroom and will enter into a different relationship with his six: a craft-trip experience with his group (two) afternoons a week after school. (This means that we will need to supply materials, space for the activities and space for storage). The students will be required to make process recordings of the group's activities. Seminars will be held (once) each week, and each student will have a period of individual supervision twice weekly. (The team will share the seminars and the supervision.)⁸

Once again readings and/or other assignments will be made as the student indicates his need for them through his questions and/or his recordings.

A task that occupied a considerable amount of time of the Planning Committee was the selection of appropriate schools for the field work experience. Because of problems related to time and travel, schools had to be selected that were relatively close to the College. Beyond this, only elementary schools with effective programs, qualified staff, and a cooperative administrative staff were considered. Once local superintendents and principals were contacted to determine which schools were interested in the Pilot Program, the Curriculum and Fieldwork Committee visited schools to

8. Brackets indicate change from original report.

determine which ones meet the requirements. In surveying the schools, it was found that relatively few could accommodate the twenty students originally planned for placement in each school. Thus, it was decided that only ten students would be placed in a school. As of June 5, 1969, the following schools were definitely selected for participation in the Program:

District 4: P.S. 83, 101, 155
District 5: P.S. 76, 149, 207
District 6: P.S. 100, 175, 92

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCE REQUIREMENTS

Currently, the School of Education has little or no control over courses offered in fields other than education. It can influence the staffing patterns in the College of Liberal Arts and Science by requiring education majors to take particular Liberal arts courses, but it has no control over which courses are offered in liberal arts, who teaches them, or the content of these courses. About the only tool the School of Education has in shaping the academic experience its students have in liberal arts courses is persuasion. Unfortunately, the value of this tool is rather limited because of the persistent antipathy most liberal arts professors feel for the field of education.

The Planning Committee identified three major areas where changes would have to occur in the College of Liberal Arts and Science if the liberal arts courses required of participants were to meet the overall objectives of the Program. These are (1) the development of a wider range of courses in black and Puerto Rican heritage and in urban studies; (2) the development of a course in Spanish, the study of which is required of all Program participants, that leads to some degree of mastery in the conversational area; and (3) the development of new interdisciplinary liberal arts courses, some of which, at least, would be integrated with the professional courses in education.

Because each department determines its own course offerings, the Director of the Program made arrangements to meet individually with the Department Chairmen in the College of Liberal Arts. Meetings were arranged with the Chairmen of the Departments of Music, Political Science, Romance Languages, Psychology, Physical Education, Mathematics, Sociology, and History. It was discovered that few courses in black and Puerto Rican heritage and urban studies are offered and those that are offered are given, for the most part, in the Departments of History, Political Science, and Sociology. Considering the times and the location of the College, the number of offerings is embarrassingly small. However, each of the Chairmen felt that it was only a matter of time before new courses would be added. The revolution incited by black and Puerto Rican students in the Spring and which closed the College for weeks most likely will accelerate the pace at which the new courses will be added.

There are a number of course offerings in the College of Liberal Arts that either are especially tailored for the needs of students planning to become teachers or have particular value for future teachers. These include special courses in mathematics, science, physical education, and psychology. However, while some courses exist, the extent to which liberal arts courses and the professional education courses are integrated is extremely slight. It is a sad commentary on American higher education, but unfortunately, this is a problem City College shares with just about every other college in the nation.⁹

Discussions with the chairman of the Romance Languages Department proved most valuable in securing a Spanish course that was especially appropriate for the needs of the participants in the Pilot Program. Traditionally, introductory courses in Spanish at the College focus upon grammar and reading skills; little work is done with conversational Spanish. The Chairman agreed, however, to set up special sections for Pilot Program participants in which the "oral" approach would be stressed from the beginning. Also, it was decided to require these courses during the first year so that students in the Program could converse with Spanish speaking students they encounter in their first year field situations. There is very little likelihood that the students will become proficient speakers of Spanish in one year. However, because of other requirements, it was practically impossible to require more than ten credits in Spanish. Those with a special interest in Spanish-speaking children may, however, take additional courses in Spanish as electives.

The most difficult issue to resolve was that of creating interdisciplinary liberal arts courses. There is simply no interest among the Liberal Arts Faculty in this kind of an approach to teaching. There is a course listed in the catalogue which was introduced by the former Dean of the College of Liberal Arts entitled Public Policy which provides a good framework for an interdisciplinary course. However, at the moment, this course is offered only in the Department of Political Science; other Departments that could offer it see no reason for doing so.

It appears that the School of Education is going to have to take a much more vigorous role in determining the content of courses offered in the College of Liberal Arts and Science if an interdisciplinary course is to be established. One direction it might take would be to reconstitute the seminar so that the staff includes individuals from liberal art fields as well as from the field of education. Such a tactic would represent a small but important means of achieving closer integration among the separate liberal arts fields and among liberal and professional studies. Professional studies can no longer stand alone and remain viable and the liberal arts and sciences can no longer stand apart and make sense. An important question that will have to be asked when the success of the Pilot Program is being assessed, is one that relates to the degree to which the Pilot Program brought about closer integration among the several fields represented in the field of education and between liberal and professional studies.

9. James J. Shields, Jr., "Liberal and Professional Studies in the Undergraduate Curriculum" McGill Journal of Education, Vol IV, No. 1 Spring 1969.

CONCLUSION

The last five months have been extremely busy ones for the relatively small staff involved in the planning and development of the Program. However, each staff member felt obliged to contribute more than his share, even when involved in functions of a purely nuts and bolts variety and when caught in the crossfire of student revolution and a sagging university budget. What sustained them was the belief that they were bringing a large and important urban university to the brink of a radically new and important teacher education model that could easily replace the malfunctioning one that now exists.

The most encouraging finding among those who have worked in planning and developing the Program has been that the Program's objectives and format make more sense and hold more promise the longer one works with them. Many of the staff moved away from the College for their respective summer retreats and responsibilities with the suspicion that the revolution they participated in through their work in the Pilot Program may prove to be more dramatic and effective in effecting far-reaching curricular reform on the University level than the revolution many of their students participated in during the same period.

APPENDIX I

Planning and Development Committee: Faculty Membership

1. October - January 1968

Professor Donald K. Cody
Professor Florine Katz
Professor Arnold Rothstein
Professor David Sarner
Professor James J. Shields (Chairman)
Professor Therese Woodruff

2. January - June 1969

Professor Sophie Elam
Professor James Fleming
Mrs. Audrey Herr
Professor Florine Katz
Professor Samuel Meer
Mrs. Judith Ruchkin
Professor James J. Shields (Chairman)

Added:

Mr. Melvin Bye
Professor Harwood Fisher

APPENDIX II

SAMPLE PROGRAM

(Except for the courses specified, each student's program will be determined individually in consultation with an adviser. This sample program is intended to be just that, not a prescribed course of study for all students.)

<u>First Semester</u>		<u>Credits</u>
Psychology 1	General Psychology	3
Physical Education 1 or 51		1/2
Spanish 51	Elementary Spanish	5
Education 311 or 321	Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, I.	4
*Other courses		0-5
		<u>**12-17</u>
<u>Second Semester</u>		
Sociology 7	American Society	3
Physical Education 2 or 52		1/2
Spanish 52	Elementary Spanish	5
Education 312 or 322	Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, I.	4
Other courses		0-5
		<u>12-17</u>
<u>Third Semester</u>		
Sociology 10	General Anthropology	3
Physical Education 3 or 53		1/2
Education 313 or 323	Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, II.	4
Other courses		5-10
		<u>12-17</u>
<u>Fourth Semester</u>		
Political Science 1	American Government and Democracy	3
Physical Education 4 or 54		1/2
Education 314 or 324	Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, II.	4
Other courses		5-10
		<u>12-17</u>
<u>Fifth Semester</u>		
Education 315 or 325	Education Field Work Laboratory and Seminar, III.	4
***Other courses		8-13
		<u>12-17</u>

Appendix II - Page Two

Sixth Semester

Education 316 or 326

Education Field Work Laboratory
and Seminar, III.

***Other courses

Credits

4

8-13

12-17

Seventh Semester

Education 317 or 327

Student Teaching and Seminar

***Other courses

6

6-8

12-14

Eighth Semester

Education 318 or 328

Student Teaching and Seminar

***Other courses

6

6-8

12-14

*Includes core, concentration and elective courses, for each semester.

**Students unable to undertake a full college program may take a reduced schedule, each semester, under advisement.

***Must include one course in each of the following groups:

1. History 10 Approaches to History (Ethnic Groups)
History 50 The Negro in the Western Hemisphere

History of Puerto Rico
African-American History
2. Sociology 51 City and Community
Sociology 58 Ethnic Minority Groups